

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 17, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-7 were pending, and rejected claims 1-7. Claims 1-7 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-7 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Stokes.

Stokes discusses a system that converts a color signal. After the conversion (that is, after the color is determined to be an "OUT-OF-GAMUT" color (figure 3), Stokes determines whether the conversion has resulted in a color name border violation by comparing color names ("SAME NAME"). This same name comparison is an exact match type comparison between names type comparison. If a color name border violation has occurred, the original color signal is converted by a different method ("REMAP").

The claims 1-5 indicate that the present invention determines whether color data is in a "vicinity" of a gamut. (See vicinity 1 : the quality or state of being near - Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary copyright © 2005 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated). That is, an exact match need not be found. This is in contrast to the exact match ("SAME NAME") comparison to determine whether a color is beyond a color name border in Stokes. A same name comparison need not have anything to do with being in a vicinity. They are just two different types of comparisons.

The claims 1-5 also indicate that the present invention determines (that is, performs a comparison) of the color data before the color has been converted ("before conversion"). That is, it is the data before it receives a color compression. This is, in contrast to the comparison after conversion that occurs in Stokes. The subjects of comparison are just very different.

The claims 1-5 achieve or result in a higher level of precision in a vicinity of the gamut border by using a different conversion method. This is in contrast to Stokes that prevents the color from being converted into a color with a different name. The results are also very different.

Stokes does not teach or suggest claims 1-5.

Claim 6 emphasizes that two conversion methods are used when the color is outside the gamut, one when it is in a predetermined area and a different conversion method when it is not. Stokes does not teach or suggest this.

It is submitted that the invention of the claims distinguishes over the prior art and

withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/16/15

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501